The Scotch-Cabinet Picklocke:

apprehended and examined,

IN A VIEW AND

Briefe Answer to 5 Queries, or Reasons against a Personall Treaty, betwixt the King and Parliament.

Published in a late scandalous Pamphlet, Entituled, *The Scotch Cabinet opened.*

Tending much to the hinderance of a desired happy Peace, and a further continuance of our now abhorred unnaturall War, destructive to the Kingdome.

Psal. 120. 6.

I labour for Peace, but when I speake or Treate thereof, they are ready for War.

Printed in the Yeare 1648.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
MAY 28, 1913
SUBSCRIPTION FOR
ENGLISH HISTORICAL TRACTS

The Scotch-Cabinet Picklock apprehended, &c.

THe two Kingdomes of England and Scotland by their ſeverall Petitions and Declarations, have expreſſed their longing deſires for a long wiſhed for Treaty. And this Treaty hath been long and often promiſed by the Lords and Commons: And no longer agoe then the third of this Auguſt, the Commons have wrote to the generall Aſſembly in Scotland, and ſay, wee have agreed to try whether a peace can be ſettled by a Treaty; and yet ſince this letter, a younker (who ſeemes to have been in the center of the Juncto's hearts) publiſhed five reaſons againſt any ſuch Treaty at all, and thereby would have the world believe, that this is the ſence, and the ſoule of the repreſentative of this Kingdom.

But whether this be ſo or no, I ſhall heere endeavour to anſwer his reaſons, as I finde them, and the rather for that in his Title page, he profeſſeth, that he publiſheth thoſe reaſons *to awaken the ſpirits of all true Engliſh men to take heed of the Scots deſignes*: which deſignes in his *Scots Cabinet opened*, he ſaith are.

1. *Againſt the godly, and the Army in England.*

2. *To draw on a Treaty with the King.* I will not peremptorily ſay this Reaſoner is an Independent Saint, but I deſire all Engliſhmen to take heed of ſuch wandring ſpirits, while I paſſe unto his reaſons.

Before which I cannot altogether omit the taking notice of his proemium, wherein he ſaith, that *this Perſonall Treaty is the great Diana of our new Maligniants, and is not the end, but the inſtrument of their deſignes.*

In the firſt, I conceive he alludeth to that of the 19 of the Acts, and the 28. *great is Diana of the Epheſ.* whereby he would have you underſtand the Treaty to be a great Idoll, and indeed, what ever pleaſeth not theſe Saints is idolatry; but how this Treaty ſhould become an Idoll, I am as far to ſeeke as he is.

2. But by the way obſerve the ſpirits and charity of this, and ſuch Saints, that all who ſpeake not, or doe not as they, are preſen-

ly Malignants: and thus the moſt and beſt part of this Kingdome by this Saints verdict are Idolaters and Malignants; but his tongue is his owne, and he hath the time, when he may ſpeake what he will, though none believe him, but ſuch as himſelfe.

3. And heere is another piece of his charity to condemne all, but ſuch as himſelfe, when he tearmes this Treaty an inſtrument of their deſignes, and from which (as in 3 lines after he ſaith) wee can expect nothing but miſchiefe againſt the Parliament and Kingdome: But when wee ſhall finde what theſe deſignes and miſchiefes are, (as perchance wee ſhall in the reaſons) I ſhall anſwer them, untill then I will not ſhoote at Rovers, or let my wits run a wooll-gathering as this Reaſoner doth, when he ſaith.

1. Reaſon, *A treaty is moſt unſutable to the condition of the King and Parliament, as they are now*; this is his Propoſition, which he ſeemes to prove thus.

1. The Parliament having fought againſt the King, for what they are not to treat.

2. And have got him their Priſoner.

3. What they are to treat about is already determined by the ſword.

4. And it is below the Parliament to treat with the King, having him under their power.

5. All Treaties are upon equall tearmes between Parties, who can make their conditions on both ſides.

6. No State ever treated with a conquered enemy.

7. Though he ſeeme to have new forces, its rather againſt the Treaty.

8. Wee ſee his deſignes are not for peace, but war.

His firſt Reaſon againſt the Treaty is drawne from the condition of the King, in reſpect of the Parliament; from whence he infers that the Parliament have fought againſt the King, for all which they now deſire.

2. That in this fight he is a conquered man.

3. Their Priſoner.

4. That Treaties being between Parties who are able to make conditions; the King is not ſo.

But before I examine his reaſons, I pray obſerve that in his firſt proofe he confeſſeth that which heeretofore hath been denyed; for the two Houſes ſayd the King raiſed war and fought againſt them, not they againſt him.

2. He

2. He confesseth they fought against him for that which now they treat. 1. The Militia whereby they may hold to themselves an everlasting arbytrary power over King and subjects in person and estates, whereas the two Houses said they fought against his evill Counsellours, not against the King, and not for all those things now to be treated on, but to bring him to his great Counsell, for the maintainance of the Protestant Religion established, for the Lawes of this Kingdome, for the liberties and propriety of the Subject. Now which shall I believe? Truely this man rather then those, for that wee know fooles will tell truth rather then knaves.

But grant they did fight for all this; yet why not to treat? No saith he, for the King is now a conquered person, and a prisoner, and therefore not to be treated with; but stay a little, not so fast with your empty cart, you did fight against the King for these, but by what Law of God or man? or regard you not these? It should seeme not; so that *quocunq; modo rem*, is become the tenet of the new Saints; but should you not consider this; first, whether on these grounds you should have fought against your King?

2. Whether a King may be, or can be said to be conquered by his Subjects? to the assoyling which, tell me (if you be an Independent that allow or regard the holy Scripture) where finde you precept, counsell, or example warranted by God, that ever Subjects fought against their King upon such grounds or causes as you say this war was?

2. Not to quote Scripture to you (whom I finde not in all your Cabinet or Treaty to regard any) nor to cite our Lawes (which you are as careles of) yet doth not Mr. St. *John*, and *Pym* acknowledge our King, this King *Charles* to be the *Head*, the *Father*, the *Husband*, of this people in England? and may the *Wife*, the *Child*, the *Members* of the Body fight against the *Head*, the *Father*, the *Husband*?

2. If the Wife a sturdy strammell queane get her Husband down, or a strong sonne his Father, or the hands the head, can they be sayd to conquer these? or to make and keepe them their prisoners?

3. I could prove this to be against all Law of God, nature, and man; but I shall fight with you at your owne weapon, holds this to reason? I dare say no reasonable man will say it.

4. Or that it were below the wife, the child, the Members to treat with the head, the Father, the Husband, only because (as you

ſay) they have got him under their power: But I expected this man of reaſons, would firſt have proved that the two Houſes might upon their grounds, according to Gods and mans Lawes have fought againſt the King.

2. That they might conquer him.

3. That they might take and keepe him priſoner; but not a word of this, or any thing like it, but as though the argument *a facto ad jus* held good, his reaſon is but this, the two Houſes, how wickedly, traiterouſly, unjuſtly ſoever wee care not, have fought againſt, overcome the King, and hold the King Priſoner, therefore it is unfutable to treat; *for no State ever treated with a conquered enemy.*

But are you ſure no State ever did? or care you not what you ſay? but had no State ever done it, what is this to the preſent caſe, unleſſe you prove this to be, as it is called by ſome a State, and not a Kingdome?

2. Unleſſe you prove the King the Kingdomes enemy:

3. That the King may be conquered by his owne Subjects.

And to this laſt, though the two Houſes have not to my knowledge, within theſe two yeares at leaſt, openly and expreſly declared the King, the Kingdomes enemy; yet may you affirme and publiſh him ſo, becauſe he grants not what you, or what the two Houſes would? For have the members, the wife, the child, a juſt power ſo to doe againſt the head, the husband, the father? and this now can be the only cauſe why at preſent (he being as you call him your conquered priſoner) he can in your ſence be called your enemy, becauſe he will not grant what you would have.

Ob. Some urge that he is an enemy if he grant not what the two Houſes would have.

Sol. It followes not? for grant that 20 (all the children of a Father and all the members of the body) ſhould require that of the Father, and the head, which he ſees he cannot in conſcience or judgement, in reſpect of himſelfe grant, no not in reſpect of their good that aske it: is he therefore to be accounted their enemy? and if not, which he is not, then much leſſe in this caſe; for ſay the two Houſes deſire it, yet 20 Lords and 200 Commons are not the Kingdome, ſo that all deſire not.

Ob. But theſe are the repreſentative of the Kingdome?

Sol. The 20 Lords repreſent none but themſelves, ſo that they are barely but 20 perſons, and there are I dare ſay almoſt 100

Lords

Lords beſides, who are not of their mindes.

2. And for the Commons now ſitting, I dare ſay they are not neere the one halfe of them which have any right to their places in Parliament, being thruſt or crept in by feare or force or without due election: might I not adde that beſides almoſt an hundred Officers and Commanders in war being Members, can it be conceived that theſe or the reſt of the Members will deſire a peace which would ſoone ſpoile that craft, by which as the Silver-ſmith ſaid, Acts 19. they gat their wealth? for I am perſwaded that there are not 20 in that Houſe, but either live, or are great gainers by theſe continued troubles.

3. But grant they were all duly elected, and had right to vote; yet what is their juſt & lawful priviledge? what by arbitrary power to change the government of Church and State? to oppreſſe, tyranize, and to graſpe all into their owne hands, without regard to their fellow Subjects, or the publique good? and can you conceive that the people, if they ever had ſuch power, did grant all this againſt themſelves to their Repreſentors?

4. But ſuppoſe the people, not knowing what they did, when they choſe thoſe men, conceiving they had been, and would continue honeſt, and carefull of their good, and therefore they made them their Atturnies to ſpeak and act for them for 6 or 12 months: muſt it therefore follow that they ſhall hold it 10 20 yeares without revocation, eſpecially when the people perceive their truſt to be uſed all againſt themſelves?

5. And that this is ſo cannot be denyed, when the great City and Counties cry out againſt their actions, and dayly and hearcily petition for a redreſſe to their miſeries, ſuſtained by their ſitting ſo long, and ſo voting.

Ob. But the people are mutable, and not ſo wiſe as they ſhould be, to know and deſire their owne good, ſo well as the wiſe men of the great Counſell.

Sol. I confeſſe you ſayd true, that they were not ſo wiſe as they ſhould have been to chuſe ſuch Atturnies for them, neither are they ſo wiſe yet as they may be, ſo long to ſuffer ſuch men to rule and ride them: but in good earneſt may wee thinke, that the Houſe at Weſtminſter hath ſuch a ſingular power and influence to make all men ſo wiſe that ſit there? wee finde it not when they come abroad; nor ſhall wee (I believe) when they ſhall leave that Houſe:

But

But in Gods name, why may wee not thinke, that the Aldermen and Common-Counsell of London are as wise, and know what is good for them and that City, as *Pennington, Ven, Vassall? &c.* and that the Gentlemen and others in other Counties are as wise as their Attornies? But it is observed that mad men thinke all others mad but themselves, though those others who are deemed mad, know those to be so, I feare you will hold me little better to treat so long as I doe with such mad men, who argue, but without all reason; I'le therefore touch but one branch more of the first reason, which is:

All Treaties are between Parties who can make their conditions on both sides; whereas the King is in the capacity of a conquered Person.

Resp. If it be granted what this Reasoner affirms and proclaims, that the two Houses and Army have conquered the King the head, is not then the body the Kingdome conquered with and under the head, which is the King? And then doe you not wisely, O yee people of England, to defend, maintaine, and pay at the charge and expence of your estates and blood, these two Houses and Army to be your conquerors, and you their perpetuall slaves? O that I could not say that this were too true, which with shame to this Nation, must be recorded to all Posterity: But if this be true, that the King is so conquered, that he hath not power to make his conditions, yet it proves not your justice, charity or goodnesse, but the contrary; that you respect neither of these nor any such thing, but that if *per fas* or *nefas*, you have got the power, that so you will hold it: But for your own sakes consider, that the King is not so low in strength, nor your power or sword so strong, but that he may be able to make conditions better for himselfe and his people, then you or a leading Faction would wish: Let me remember you, but with your owne words, though the King hath a new force, yet it is against the Treaty, and for war, not peace; be that your unchristian uncharitablenesse, such as to usurp upon Gods prerogative, to search the heart especially of a King, which is as deepe waters, and to judge amisse, yet (which is to the point) you confesse, he hath such a force, and therefore which is against your reason, not in so low a condition, but that he may in respect heereof treat.

And to this confession of yours, let me adde, that you shall or may finde. through Gods mercy to the King, and for their sakes whom he desires to relieve in their suffrings, and for the crying sins

of

of thoſe who have raiſed, and maintained this moſt unjuſt, bloody & unnaturall war againſt him, and his moſt oppreſſed people; this force now raiſed for the King, may appeare ſuch, that in a ſhort time you will not be in a condition to be treated with; and will you be content to heare of your owne argument, which you heere urge againſt the King? Let me put you in minde, for cloſe to your firſt reaſon, that many a good peace hath been loſt for want of a timely offered Treaty; and that many by coveting (as our Proverbe hath it) to hold all, have loſt all. *Serò ſapiunt Phryges*, may be a good leſſon, and caveat at this time to ſuch as you are.

2. *Reaſon.* This Treaty ſtrikes deepely at the priviledges of Parliament, which hath been one of the great things fought for, in the the late war againſt the King.

Heere 2 things are affirmed.

1. That this Treaty ſtrikes, &c. for which he after gives his proofes, which wee ſhall conſider.

2. That for theſe priviledges they fought againſt the King.

And that the two Houſes fought againſt the King, is more then they have confeſſed: for they profeſſed they fought for the King and Parliament; ſo that you or they are the liars; unleſſe you diſtinguiſh that they fought for (*i. e.*) for to conquer and take him, and yet againſt him (*i. e.*) to deſtroy him; but in this diſtinction, I find either that equivocation which a Proteſtant ſhould not profeſſe, or that flat downe villany that a Chriſtian ſhould not practiſe.

And when you ſay, they fought for the priviledges of Parliament, was this ever declared to be the end of the war? or if it were one end, was it ever propounded to, or denyed by the King? and will any ſober Chriſtian fight before he declare the cauſe, and have a denyall of what he asks? 2 But againe, had they been denyed any priviledges, did they before fighting ſhew which they were, and prove that they juſtly were their priviledges? for before they had ſeized the King, Navy, Townes, and Forts, what priviledges did they require and prove theirs which were denyed? but the man doth inſtance, when he ſaith, *they againe give the King the power of his Negative voice, which was the great controverſie formerly*; and when I pray was this the controverſie before this Parliament? and till you inſtance in ſome act or time, when this was, I have nothing to anſwer; but that I dare peremptorily ſay it was never: and when you ſay, *they give him againe his Negative Voice in that they treat*

with him; consider whether that can be properly said to be given againe, that was never taken away? For shew me so much as an Ordinance, that the King should have no Negative voice? I may believe, that they would take away his voice, and Crowne, and more; but God be thanked, yet they have not, and therefore cannot be said to give it him againe by treating.

2. Had they taken it away in Parliament, yet by treating with him on other things, they doe not absolutely and fully give it him againe.

3. But whether they would, or have taken away his voice in *facto*, if they have attempted, or doe it unjustly, is it reason, therefore to treat whether he should have it againe? and that it is unjust, if done, will appeare, that in all just and lawfull Parliaments, Kings of England have had, and used their Negative Voices when they would; and this stands with all reason divine and humane, that no man should be forced to yeeld assent to that, which is against his Oath, his conscience, or against himselfe; it were to make the King in a lower and worse condition then any Subject; for that no binding Lawes are made without the Subjects assent, personall, or by their proxie, or representor, neither of which the King hath.

4 The second proofe heere brought, to shew that this Treaty strikes at the Priviledges of Parliament, is, for that heereby it will be a great dishonour to the Parliament of England to go 20 miles to treat with their enemy; where,

1. I never heard or understood, that it was any dishonour to Subjects to go 20 miles to treat with their King; but if it be, they may take this dishonour away, by letting the King come 40 miles from Carisbrooke to them at Westminster, and so put the dishonour upon him.

2. When they speake of the Parliament, they must know that when the Parliament is dishonoured, the King himselfe is concerned, and that more principally, as being the most principall part thereof the head, and the Fountaine of all honour to this Kingdome.

3. That the dishonour should be in treating with their enemy, I touched before: that the King neither is, nor can be justly and truely called their enemy, only because he would maintaine his owne, and their right, or chastice them for doing wrong, or by fatherly correction to reduce them.

4. And

4. And when he saith, he is their enemy, in that he raised an Army to destroy them, it is too well knowne, that (as before I said) he never moved for his owne and his peoples defence (to both which he is bound) untill they had armed against both; and if you remember your selfe, you confesse in this, and in your former reason that the 2 Houses fought against the King.

5. What you urge that the King would not owne them for a Parliament, may be true, for without him (he being the King driven away) the two Houses cannot make a Parliament.

6. The King for ought I read or remember, never denyed all the Members in each House sitting at Westminster to be Members of the two Houses, although some Members of them might be, or might be proclaimed Traytours.

7. And *that it is a dishonour to the two Houses to treat with the King a prisoner*; they must know, it is no dishonour, but an honour to them to treat with their King, and all the dishonour is in those Subjects, who make him a prisoner; I and in all those his Subjects, who endeavour not to free, and release him from that dishonourable and base thraldome.

The Reasoner hath jumbled this into the throng of privileges under his second reason, that *by this Treaty the King will get his old Prerogative, and his old Power*: And is this a losse of their Privilege, that the King get again his own old power and Prerogative? for do wee not (in the *Protestation, Vow*, and *Covenant*) sweare to both, as that both may stand together, and both be maintained?

2. When you call them his old power and Prerogative, I can desire no better testimony against you, then this, that the power you feare he will get, is anciently his.

3. In that you say he will get or recover his old power againe? imply you not, that it hath beene lately forced away from him; and if so, what dishonour, or breach of Privileges can it be to the two Houses to let him have it againe? Give unto God the things that are Gods, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, is Gods owne judgment. But my Reasoner tells you further, *That the King and the two Houses have fought for the preeminence, and the Parliament have obtained it by the sword, and therefore it will reflect upon their Honours and wisdome to give that away which they have by victory.*

That the two Houses have fought against the King, and for pre-

 eminence

eminence, is the more their ſhame, the greater their diſloyalty and treaſon; but to ſay that the King fought for that which he knows is his owne, and that they cannot take from him, is moſt untrue, he never fought with them for preeminence.

2. And when you ſay they have obtained it by the ſword, hold you this a good argument? I finde indeed that it is the maine, if not the onely hinge, or ſtrength rather of all your reaſons, we have it by the ſword: I confeſſe in a juſt war, by Lawfull authority (which this of the two Houſes againſt the King, can never be proved to be) conqueſt by the ſword is a ſtrong reaſon to make a good tenure; But ſimply and barely to ſay wee have it by the ſword, therefore it is juſt, and we may hold it ſo, follows not: for ſo the Turk, and the Pope, and the Dragon argue againſt the Saints, Apoc. 13.

And I have not found in all your reaſonings, any proofe to maintaine the juſtneſſe, and the Lawfullneſſe of your war or conqueſt by the ſword; onely ſtill you lay about you with the ſcabberd of a reaſon in ſtead of a ſword, and ſay we have got it by the ſword; and how this will take with men of wiſedome and honour, gueſſe you, but I am ſure it cannot with men of juſtice: And when you urge that this *condeſcenſion of the two Houſes, in letting the King reinjoy his preeminence, will reflect upon the wiſedome and honour of the two Houſes:* I dare ſay, what ever you meane by reflect, that if they reſtore him to his old preeminence, as you call it, it will redound to their wiſedome and honour with all perſons of honour and wiſdome; but eſpecially if they have a touch of juſtice and honeſty. But before I leave this ſecond reaſon, let me obſerve that hitherto all your reſons are grounded on power and force, and backed by policy and reputation; but in all not a word of God, of his word, of mans Law, nor of juſtice, nor of honeſty; and now I am in ſo far, and have obſerved it, I am aſhamed, and beſhrew my ſelfe that I have had ſo much to do with a meere pollitique Saint, or an atheiſticall Independent.

And yet I cannot altogether let paſſe the cloſe of his Second reaſon, where he ſaith, *that if the Parliament* (he meaneth though ignorantly or abſurdly by this the two Houſes) *intended to have given away their Priviledges to the King, they might have ſpared ſo much blood to the Kingdome.*

How the Kings old power, Prerogative, and preeminence, is become a Priviledge of the two Houſes, I know not; unleſſe (as the Reaſoner

saith) by the sword; and what Title that is I have briefly spoken before.

2. And that they might have spared so much blood of the Kingdoms I confesse is one, if not the only one Christianly or humane passage that I finde in all his reasons; and what he saith they might have done, I say, and he should have said too, that they should have spared so much blood; But such Saints as these (like the ancient and worst of Idollaters) delight in the sacrificing of mans blood.

3. But another observation I think is worth your taking, that this Saint, when generally the other cry out of the King, for having shed so much blood, and that therefore they will have him satisfie for it; yet this good man (I feare before he was aware) tels truth, and it may be he shall heare of it; for he saith (at least implies) that the two Houses have shed the blood: for in that they might have spared it, implies it not at least that they shed it? for *qui non vetat cum potest jubet.*

3. *Reason.* From which I am brought to the 3 Reason; which as it abates of the bitternesse, so it comes short in matter of length, and shaddow of reason; and accordingly I shall abate in length of answer to it: for it briefely saith, That this Personall Treaty was declined and protested against by both Kingdomes, though offered by the King, when he was far from the condition, now he is in, and was out of the reach of Parliamentary power, and when wee had no parties nor divisions, and therefore how much more inconvenient will it be now, when wee have so many warpings in our best actions, and it is only propounded by one party as a designe?

Resp. Whether some such Personall Treaty was offered by the King, and declined by both Kingdomes, I cannot say whether it be so or no; but I dare say, that this individuall Treaty, for so he saith, that is this, for matter, manner, and circumstance was never offered.

2. But grant it had been; who in reason doth not know, but that, that which was offered and refused a yeare or two, or more sithence, may now upon change of causes, events, and circumstances, without inconvenience to either party, be taken againe into consideration, and proceeded in?

3. When it is sayd, that the Treaty was offered by the King, and refused by the two Kingdomes, when the King was far from the condition he is now in; I conceive he meanes that the King was

not then in so low a condition as now; for he addes, that he was then out of the Parliaments power; but to this they may know, that though the Person of the King be now in their power, yet the Kings power (I believe) is, and so it will be found to exceed theirs, and therefore though his condition be the lower, in that he is under restraint, yet he is in a better condition now, then he was then, in that God hath opened the eyes, enlarged the hearts, and strengthned the hands of the greatest part of three Kingdomes, for the rescue and deliverance of his person, and for the restoring him to his just rights, whether by or without a Treaty, according to their severall antient, and more generall, and their later more speciall renewed protestations and oaths.

When he saith, *it is more inconvenient* for them *to treat now, when they have so many warpings in their actions, then at that time, when they had no parties nor divisions*; I conceive when they had no parties nor divisions among themselves, they had the lesse reason to stoope to a Treaty; for as they had the greater strength in men and money: So had they the people by their delusions more united together and knit to them; whereas now when they finde not only divisions among themselves, but warpings in their best actions, now to my reason, they are more concerned, for their owne security, and to make their peace, to yeeld, yea to sue to the King for a Treaty.

And when he saith, *the Treaty is propounded only by one party, as a designe*; it is strange to me, that the House of Lords and Commons, and the Kingdome of Scotland, and the City, and most Counties, and people of England, must in respect of his owne faction of Saints or Independents, go under the notion and stile but of one party; as though these Saints were alone the Kingdome, or Kingdomes, because they as madly hold, that they alone are the people of God, and have right to the Land, and what is therein.

And as uncharitable and unreasonable it is to say, that what all these in the two Kingdomes desire, is but a designe, though it tend to a lasting peace; and what ever his party would, though against a Treaty, must be construed as holy, and just, though it be only for the maintainance and propogation of their more wicked designes, and all tending inevitably and speedily to the ruine and destruction of so happy and flourishing a Kingdome.

4. *Reason.* The fourth reason against this Treaty he drawes from the little hope of successe that he conceives this Treaty can finde, when

when he thus saith, *There is not any hope of any good successe in setling our peace by such a Treaty, but rather the contrary.*

Resp. To which, though either he doth not, or will not see any hope of successe, or not of such a peace as he would; what therefore must not they try, & treat, who does see great, very great hopes of a peace, a good peace, and by a Treaty as the only best humane expedient? wee plow, wee plant, wee sow, and all but in hope, and if all should forbeare to plant or sow untill sure of successe, we might want both fruit and graine: and I pray let me aske you in your many battles you have (as you professe) fought against your King, were you sure still of successe before you went forth? Let me adde, though there were but little, yea scarce any hope of a successe, yet in so miserable a case, as this Kingdome now is in; why not try what a Treaty will effect? for so there be neither sinne nor illegality in it, why not try? *quid enim tentasse nocebit?* were the people sure of a successe (*Josuah* the sixt) when they blew their trumpets before the walls of Jericho? or Naaman (the second of Kings and the fifth) of a cleansing from his leprosie by washing in Jordan? but you will tell me they had directions and command to doe these from heaven, and that was assurance enough: and have not wee the like? For what is that Ps. 34. 14. seeke peace, and pursue it (though it flye from you?) and Rom. the 12 the 18. If it be possible, as much as lyeth in you, live peaceable with all men. In which Texts wee are commanded to strive and endeavour by all possible meanes, he saith not by all probable meanes, but though they seeme improbable, yet by all possible meanes to seeke peace; and when you so much labour against this way to it, why tell you us not of a better, or more compendious way then a Treaty? but I conceive (pardon me if I misgueſſe you) you are not so much afrayd of a Treaty the meanes, as of a peace the end; for heerby you may fear that (as our Lord and Saviour sayd of the day, so I may of a peace) this would bring your workes to light, and make manifest what abominations you have committed under the name and covert of a War.

To which he argueth, that the *Propositions* (to bee treated on) *must be the same as they were, and these the King hath denied, and therefore little hope &c.* To the first I must aske him how he knoweth that the Propositions must be the same in number, matter, form? 2. Why they may not be changed in some at least? 3. If the same, yet

yet why may not theſe ſame, by the wiſdome and moderation of the two Houſes, have ſuch qualifications, as it may pleaſe God to move the King to give his aſſent, if hee ſhall ſee it ſhall bee for his peoples good?

Reaſon 5. But this Reaſoner conceiving ſure that he hath kept the reſerve, as the ſtrength of all his arguments; to this laſt he ſaith, which is his 5. Reaſon: *It is moſt dangerous (as things ſtand) and hazardous to the Parliament and Kingdome, to have a Treaty.*

Reſp. One thing I cannot but obſerve (though by, or out of the way) which is, that this Reaſoner throughout, prefers the Parliament before the Kingdome; as though hee had more minde to the ſtanding and power of that then this: for who knowes not that the perſons now in the two Houſes are the leaſt, the meaneſt part of the Kingdome? 2. That ſuch a part is not to bee preferred before the whole. 3. That it is the Kingdome that makes, maintains and gives them the power they have: but affection makes men blind. I will ſay no more, but will examine the ſtrength of his reaſons; whereof the firſt is:

Wee ſee what influence even the abſence of the King hath had upon the people, how much greater would his preſence have? And doubtleſſe when ever there is ſuch a conjunction of King and Parliament, wee ſhall ſoone finde he is the head.

And from hence wee ſee the aime and end of all this reaſoning againſt the Treaty, *viz.* feare that the King ſhould appeare to be head of the Kingdome and Parliament; ſo that what the King truely and rightly is by the Law of God and this Kingdome, and the deſire of all good Chriſtian Subjects, this fellow holds to be the only danger and hazard to the Parliament.

But, in Gods name, what would he ſhould become of the King? is he of *Cromwells* and *Ralfes* minde? better this fellow and all ſuch were where they deſerved to be, who are of his minde.

2. Would he that this Kingdome ſhould be, and continue an headleſſe Monſter, without true ſenſe, or due motion, ſeeing theſe proceed from and only from the head?

3. Or would he that this Kingdome ſhould move as a worme, or a ſnake, where the tayle the people move the reſt? I feare this is his meaning: yet I truſt that all the men of this Kingdome will rather deſire to be ruled and moved (as men) by their heads, who

in

in Gods Law and ours, is the King; and not as beasts, the worst and baseſt of beasts, by the tayle: and then the danger which this fellow feares will ſoone be over.

But this fellowes head is ſo full of feares, that he hath dreamed of another danger ariſing from a Treaty; for, ſaith he, *It is dangerous in point of ſecurity*: and addes; *there can be no ſafety without an Army*. So that heere is his ſecond feare, that the Army in the time of, or after the Treaty, ſhall not continue, and be in force; and then concludes *no man can promiſe a quiet ſitting, and ſure parting*. But why not, I pray? For who hath more frighted and forced the two Houſes then the Army? who have oppreſſed, inſlaved, and ſlaughtered the good people more then the Army? and therefore what is more deſired by the generall vote and petition of the two Kingdomes, then the disbanding the Army? and yet what in the judgement of the wiſeſt is the beſt ſecurity to all theſe, hee accounts the greateſt danger of all, *viz.* the putting downe of the Army.

But tumults, ſayth he, *are now riſing in every County, that we can not foreſee to prevent without an Army*. But what tumult is there in any County, except that of the Army? or ſuch as is occaſioned or rayſed by the Army? Let the Army bee disbanded, and without all peradventure, all tumults will ceaſe in all Counties, except the Divell rayſe ſome Independent Saints to make tumults.

But the fellow is not quit of all his feares yet, and therefore propounds, *What if the King and Parliament ſhould not agree? it will be harder to bring him backe to his former condition againe*. You may eaſily tracke this fellow by the ſent, and heere you may ſee his feare; that a Treaty being on foot, they ſhall hardly carry the King backe to *Carisbroke*, under the hands of *Cromwell*, *Hammon*, and *Kolfe*. I, heere is the feare, heere the danger of all; ſo that what is the deſire of all honeſt, loyall, Chriſtian Subjects, that the King ſhould be as he ought to be, free; this to this Reaſoner, and his deſperate complices, is the great danger.

And yet he is troubled with another feare beſides all the former, leſt *in the time of treaty ſome rude and barbarous men ſhould ſurprize the Parliament, or at leaſt ſome eminent Members which they finde moſt eminent and active*. And are there any more rude and barbarous men to be feared in this caſe, then thoſe you hold your beſt ſecurity, ſoldiers ſo principled? who are drencht in blood, and have

 ſcarce

ſcarce any other meanes whereby to live then by broiles, oppreſſion, rapine, and ſhedding of blood? and whom may a Parliament more feare then theſe?

But though this fellow clapt in the word Parliament, to be in danger, yet he ſoone explanes himſelfe in the ſame line, and as though he cared not much for the Parliament; ſo ſome of the moſt eminent active members be preſerved; he addes *they may ſurprize the Parliament, or at leaſt ſome moſt eminent and active Members*: and it were eaſie to *Say*, whom he meanes by the moſt eminent and active members, beſides *Naworth*, the brave *Olivers*, *may-Mild*, *&c.*

And yet this timerous gooſe is not paſt feare yet, for he goes on and tells you, *that the King never had more deſperate deſignes againſt the Parliament, then when he ſent to treat with them, witnes Brainford.* And heere although I finde not that the King ſends now to the two Houſes, but they to him for a Treaty; yet I muſt needs con this fellow thankes, for the confeſſion of a truth, when he profeſſeth that the King never had more deſperat deſigns againſt the Parliament, then when he ſent for a Treaty: and inſtanceth only in that of Brainford. So that, by this Reaſoners acknowledgement, the King never had greater deſigne againſt the Parliament, then in that buſineſſe of Brainford, and his deſigne in that was only this, that while he ſent to the two Houſes to treat with them, he finding in the meane time, that they had almoſt ſurrounded him with their Army, his deſperate deſigne was to quit himſelfe of them; and this was that buſineſſe of Brainfrod, and ſo the truth is that was the moſt deſperate deſigne that ever the King had againſt the Parliament.

And this Wigin having hitherto acted the part of a Reaſoner beyond, or without all reaſon, he now in the cloſe takes upon him to be a Counſellour; and therefore he ſayth, *It is good for the Parliament to keepe their diſtance, and maintains their ground, for they have loſt too much by their lenity and credulity.*

Sure, his Parliament, the two Houſes are in a witleſſe condition, that muſt ſtand in neede of his counſell, which is to ſtand their ground, and keepe their diſtance. For what if they cannot ſtand their ground? Can his counſell inable them to it? No whit more, then when the Conſtable bad the Drunkard ſtand, when he was reeling to the ground.

But

But the ground of his counſell ſurpaſſeth the counſell it ſelfe (which he gives them with an Aſſes carry-combe;) for forſooth, they have loſt too much by their lenity and credulity.

I confeſſe, I have heard and knowne much of their credulity, when they gave eare to, and proclaymed many ſtrange plots by ſea and land; as in Lincolnes-Inne-Fields, Moore-Fields, Ragland Caſtle, a Navy from Denmarke, and 1000 more groſſe impoſtures of their owne making.

But of their lenity, I profeſſe I never yet heard a ſyllable; unleſſe it hath appeared in rayſing forces to fright and awe the honeſt and honourable Members in Parliament; or in counſelling their band-Dogs to worry and ſlaughter the well affected, for preſenting their humble Petitions; or in giving power to any three of the Houſe of Commons to impriſon whom they would, (15. June 1648.) or in giving power to any the three of the two Houſes (as 21 Apr. 1648) or in granting Commiſſions to kill and ſlay, even without all exception, I, not excepting the King or Prince: and if this be their lenity, The Lord deliver all good Chriſtians from ſuch, and from their lenity.

The Reaſoner is now at an end, and (as Divells uſually have been preſented) he goes off with a ſtinke, notorious ſtinking lies: for he ſayth; *The Parliament hath cauſe to reject the motion of a treaty:* (*i.*) They have cauſe to reject their owne motion: for it is their owne, and it is time they ſhould make it, and proceed in it to: but why ſhould they reject their owne motion? Have you a reaſon for this to? yes, and ſtore to: and the chiefe is, *Becauſe the King hath againe rayſed his Party againſt the Parliament.* And have the two Houſes at any time of late declared ſo much? or would they not have declared it if they had knowne it? But alas good King, had he been willing to raiſe his party (and why ſhould not he raiſe a party againſt them that impriſon him and oppreſſe al his good people?) yet how could he raiſe any Forces he having been under their power, and cloſe reſtraint above theſe 12 moneths?

His ſecond Reaſon is, *That the King hath called in the Scots to deſtroy the Kingdome.* The Scots, by order of their Parliament, have declared and proteſted the chiefe cauſes of their comming in, to be the ſetling Religion, ſetting the King at liberty, and to procure a laſting peace: and this ended, quietly and ſpeedily to depart: and to theſe ends why may not the King call in the

Scots? But tell me I pray, are the Scots so easie as to come at the Kings call? or were you present, and heard the King call them in? or care you not what you say? or feare you not to raise jealousies and slanders; so they may tend to the seducing and abusing the silly easie people, thereby to joine with you in your treasonable, bloudy, divellish practises, masked all under sanctity, Religion, conscience, and tender regard of Parliament?

At the last close of all, this man is brought to some reason, and with that I will conclude as he doth: I wish, saith he, *that Personall honesty, and Reformation might be thought upon by every man, and then we should soone see a publique deliverance:* and in this I agree with him; and I do more then wish, I heartily pray to God by the mediation of his only sonne, our Lord Jesus Christ to grant to us all, and to this Reasoner, and all of his leaven, Personall honesty and reformation; and then we should not doubt but (by Gods blessing) soone to see a publique deliverance. Amen, Amen Sweet Jesu.

Finally Brethren, pray for us, that we may be delivered from unreasonable, or absurd, and wicked men. 2. *Thess.* 3.

FINIS.